IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB AND HARYANA AT CHANDIGARH.

Crl.M. No.33944-M of 2007

Date of Decision: 24.5.2007

Smt. Kokila and another.

....Petitioners.

Versus

State of Haryana and others.

...Respondents.

Present:- Mr.Jasbir Mor,Advocate
for the petitioners.

****

S.S.SARON, J.(ORAL)

The petitioners by way of the present petition under Section 482 Cr.P.C. seek direction for directing the official respondents to provide them police protection and also direct the respondents not to interefere with the liberty and married life of the petitioners. A further direction is sought against respondents No.2 to 4 not to register any criminal case against the petitioners and family members of petitioner No.2.

Both the petitioners are stated to be major. The date of birth of petitioner No.1 is 29.8.1987. She is more than 19 years of age. She is a student of B.A. Part III. The date of birth of petitioner No.2 is 15.10.1985. He is more than 21 years old. He is a graduate and presently running coaching/information centre. The petitioners met each other and they developed a liking for each other. Ultimately they decided to marry. The proposal for marriage was not to the liking of the relatives and parents of petitioner No.1. Therefore, respondents No.5 and 6 who are the parents of

petitioner No.1 became annoyed. The petitioners, therefore, solemnised their marriage among themselves on 21.4.2007 at Shri Nagkeshetra Mandir, Safidon, District Jind. The photographs showing the solemnisation of marriage have been placed on record as Annexure P4. Besides the certificate issued by Mahant of Shri Nagkshetra Mandir, dated 21.4.2007 (Annexure P3) has been placed on record. It is alleged that due to the solemnisation of the marriage the petitioners are being harassed by their parents and respondents No.5 and 6 and also by respondent No.7 who is the maternal uncle of petitioner No.1. Therefore, they seek protection of their life and liberty. The petitioners also have submitted an application dated 19.5.2007 (Annexure P5) to the Superintendent of Police, Jind (respondent No.2). However, it is submitted that the same has not been attended to.

After giving my thoughtful consideration to the matter and hearing learned counsel for the parties it would be appropriate in the facts and circumstances that the grievances of the present petitioners are looked into by respondents No.2 to 4 who would be in a better position to ascertain the ground reality and in the facts and circumstances also grant the necessary relief.

Accordingly, the present petition is disposed of with a direction to respondents No.2 to 4 that in case the petitioners approach any of them setting out their grievances as have been made in the present petition, the same would be looked into by them independently and in accordance with law.

(S.S.SARON)
JUDGE

May 24,2007
Reema